

To the Federal Communications Commission:

First, I would like to say thank you for taking the time out to read my thoughts regarding AT&T's acquisition of T-Mobile USA. I have been a T-Mobile customer for about nine years and I have had the pleasure to enjoy their low monthly service plans, exceptional customer service and the reliability of their mobile network. In order to understand my thoughts on the AT&T acquisition of T-Mobile it may be helpful to understand where it all began.

As a freshman at the University of Florida, I entered a T-Mobile store without the support of a parent and the long-standing history of credit. T-Mobile was able to start me with a low monthly service plan, an affordable deposit and a free phone. The same was not true when I visited competitors such as Verizon Wireless, AT&T, which at the time was Cingular Wireless or Sprint. As the years have progressed, I continue to enjoy a low monthly service plan, great customer service and quality phones from T-Mobile. AT&T believes this will continue and has gone to extraneous efforts to convince your Commission; however let us evaluate their claims.

AT&T Comment: "Consumers will not have to make any changes to their T-Mobile USA services or devices upon the close of this transaction. Their handsets will continue to work, and they can remain on their current rate plans. The transaction merely gives them the highly valuable option to take advantage of more advanced service technologies, a broader range of devices, and additional rate plans."

**Response: AT&T stresses consumers will not have to make any changes to their T-Mobile USA services or devices upon the "close of this transaction." This is admirable, but I would like to ask AT&T what assurances do consumers have for the remaining years following the transaction? Many consumers, such as me are on grandfathered loyalty plans, which will continue to operate as long as T-Mobile remains whole or until they go bankrupt. It is one thing to be forced to make changes due to a company no longer operating, as it is to make changes once a company is purchased. In circumstances such as these, the purchasing company may involuntarily force changes over the upcoming years, while the consumer is still locked in a contract they did not sign with the original company. These changes will happen eventually as AT&T states, "it will require the affected T-Mobile USA UMTS subscribers to obtain new handsets, given that their current handsets cannot provide UMTS service outside the AWS band and cannot provide LTE service on any band."**

AT&T Comment: "T-Mobile USA's absence from the marketplace will not have a significant competitive impact, particularly vis-à-vis AT&T. AT&T is more focused on Verizon and Sprint than on T-Mobile USA, and AT&T too is seeing increased competitive threats from rapidly growing mavericks like MetroPCS and Leap and other providers. These other competitors can quickly replace the diminished market role T-Mobile USA plays today—and indeed have already begun to do so."

**Response: This comment does not completely analyze the marketplace T-Mobile USA holds. While it is possible mavericks such as MetroPCS and Leap are emerging as low-budget wireless providers T-Mobile USA still offers competition to AT&T as a second GSM competitor and in their Pre-Paid market. The elimination of T-Mobile USA will mean a loss of a GSM competitor and AT&T will no longer have a competitor to their technology in the USA. In addition, mavericks such as MetroPCS and Leap are not**

viable competitors for AT&T due to the regionalization of their plans. A practical example is found in my own experience. I am currently in Fresno, CA and once I heard AT&T might buy T-Mobile USA, I immediately evaluated the mavericks as an alternative option. In Fresno, this so-called maverick is Cricket. Cricket will achieve its objective of providing me service as long as I am in Fresno and surrounding California areas, however, when the need arises where I need to visit my family and friends in Georgia and Florida, I will be without service. This is not the case with T-Mobile USA.

AT&T Comment: Deutsche Telekom recently announced that, in light of its capital constraints, T-Mobile USA can no longer rely on its parent for investment funding and must instead “fund its future itself. This transaction will also give T-Mobile USA’s 34 million customers access to LTE services that will surpass T-Mobile USA’s current services in performance and network efficiency.

**Response: The ability for T-Mobile USA to fund itself is built into AT&T’s acquisition filing of T-Mobile USA. As a Commission if you deny this merger, AT&T will need to provide T-Mobile USA with 6 billion dollars and additional spectrum. This will allow T-Mobile USA capital to expand on their current HSPA+ network or make investments to LTE services. AT&T as of this date does not have a HSPA+ network nor does it have a LTE service. In fact, mobile network data speeds and call reliability at T-Mobile USA surpass AT&T’s current offerings.**

In summary, I am not a T-Mobile USA employee, lobbyist of T-Mobile, or a consultant of any manner to T-Mobile USA. I am a customer who would like to see the company remain whole until either it goes bankrupt or the company disbands. T-Mobile has consistently been a company, which relied on exceptional customer service and loyalty benefits to maintain their subscriber base. It would be truly sad to see and as Sprint mentioned un-American to eliminate a direct competitor in GSM technology and leave the marketplace with a monopoly of GSM technology. The decision is in your hands to deny this merger from taking place and keeping competition and choice alive in the marketplace. This is, after all, the American way.

Sincerely,

Jeff